



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,195	03/18/2004	Richard J. Feldmann	FELD3002CIP2/ESS	6156
23364 7590 06/03/2008 BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
BRUSCA, JOHN S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1631				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/803,195

Applicant(s)

FELDMANN, RICHARD J.

Examiner

John S. Brusca

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The objection to the specification in the Office action mailed 06 November 2007 regarding the sequence listing is withdrawn in view of the amendment filed 02 April 2008 to the sequence listing and the computer readable form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention.

In *In re Wands* (8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988)) the CAFC considered the issue of enablement in molecular biology. The CAFC summarized eight factors to be considered in a determination of "undue experimentation." These factors include: (a) the quantity of experimentation necessary; (b) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (c) the presence or absence of working examples; (d) the nature of the invention; (e) the state of the prior art; (f) the relative skill of those in the art; (g) the predictability of the art; and (h) the breadth of the claims.

In considering the factors for the instant claims:

- a) Quantity of experimentation: The only utility asserted by the specification is to use

connectron symmetries to predict control of gene expression (see for example page 8 of the specification and the preamble of claims 1-8). In order to practice the claimed invention one of skill in the art must identify and use a connectron to predict regulation of gene expression. For the reasons discussed below, there would be an unpredictable amount of experimentation required to practice the claimed invention.

b) The amount of direction or guidance presented: The claimed invention is a method of identification of sequences that have a connectron relationship and act to modulate gene expression. On pages 9-13 the specification defines connectrons as a tetradic structure between two sequences in an RNA transcript of a genomic sequence and two sequences in double stranded genomic DNA. The specification speculates without evidence that triple-stranded (triplex) structures will form between identical sequences in RNA and double stranded DNA in chromatin where connectron symmetries are identified. The specification does not provide guidance that there are any limitations on formation of triplex structures, and only implies that regions of RNA with identical sequence to one strand of a double stranded DNA sequence will form triplex structures. The specification does not address why all RNA transcripts of genes would not form a continuous triplex structure with the gene from which it is transcribed. The specification provides guidance to identify connectron symmetries in genomic sequences on pages 16-17. The specification does not provide detailed guidance to use identified connectron symmetries because the specification does not show whether or not connectrons form within cells or have an effect on gene expression. The specification does not provide specific guidance for monitoring or effecting changes in connectron behavior that correlate with gene expression.

c) The presence or absence of working examples: The specification provides working

examples of identification of connectron symmetries by computer-mediated searching of genomic sequences. However, the specification does not provide evidence that connectron symmetries in genomic sequences result in formation of triplex RNA-DNA structures or that if connectron triplex structures do exist that connectrons control gene expression. The specification does not provide working examples of using identified connectron symmetries to predict effects on gene expression. The specification does not provide working examples of monitoring or effecting changes in connectron behavior that correlate with gene expression.

d) The nature of the invention: The nature of the invention, gene expression control, is complex.

e) The state of the prior art: One of skill in the art, after reading the specification, would not know that connectron symmetries identified by computer-mediated searches of genomic sequences would allow for prediction of gene expression of genes that have connectron symmetries. The specification does not provide experimental evidence that connectron symmetries cause modulation of gene expression. Neither the prior art nor post-filing art shows connectrons. Mattick reviews effects of RNA molecules on gene regulation. Mattick does not show connectrons as defined in the instant specification. Chan et al. reviews triplex DNA formation. Chan et al. shows in figures 1A-C that short stretches of oligonucleotides may form parallel or antiparallel triplex structures. Chan et al. shows in figures 1B that parallel triplex forming oligonucleotides form bonds between C and T residues of the oligonucleotide and G and A residues of the double stranded DNA molecule. Figure 1C shows that antiparallel triplex forming oligonucleotides form bonds between A, G, and T residues of the oligonucleotide and A, G, and A residues of the double stranded DNA. Chan et al. characterize the limited range of base

pairing possibilities in triplex structures as pyrimidine binding motifs or purine binding motifs. Chan et al. describe on pages 268-273 the unpredictability and difficulty of forming desired triplex structures that are limited to the purine motif or the pyrimidine motif. Chan et al. does not show a mechanism that allows for triplex structures to form with any and all regions of identity between an RNA transcript and a region of double stranded DNA that has an identical sequence in one of the two strands of DNA, as required for connectron formation as defined in the instant specification.

f) The relative skill of those in the art: The skill of those in the art of gene expression is high.

g) The predictability of the art: The predictability of the relationship of connectron symmetries and gene expression is unknown in the prior art and is not described in the instant specification.

h) The breadth of the claims: The claims are broad in that they are drawn to identification and design of connectron symmetries whose relationship to gene expression is not established.

The skilled practitioner would first turn to the instant specification for guidance in using the claimed invention. However, the specification lacks any evidence that connectrons form in cells or that connectron symmetries are related to gene expression. As such, the skilled practitioner would turn to the prior art for such guidance, however the prior art does not discuss connectron symmetries. Chan et al. shows that triplex formation occurs only with oligonucleotides with a purine rich or pyrimidine rich motif, rather than with any identical sequence as suggested in the specification. Finally, said practitioner would turn to trial and error experimentation to determine a relationship between connectron symmetries and gene

expression. Such amounts to undue experimentation.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 02 April 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicants have not provided any evidence in the specification or their arguments that the triplex structure of connectrons form, or that knowledge of connectron symmetries can be used to predict or control gene expression. The applicants state that the specification provides a method of identification of connectron symmetries in genomic sequences. It is agreed that the specification provides a method of identification of connectron symmetries, however the specification does not enable the use of identified connectron symmetries because the specification does not establish that connectrons form in cells or that connectron symmetries allow for prediction of gene expression or that connectrons may be manipulated to control gene expression. The applicants state that the USPTO has taken the position that the applicants must prove that connectrons exist. The applicants have a burden to show that undue experimentation is not required to make and use the claimed subject matter. The rejection cites prior art evidence that triplex structures hypothesized by the specification are not known to form by the prior art rules of triplex polynucleotide structure formation. As such the USPTO has shown compelling evidence the prior art cannot be relied upon to enable the instant claimed subject matter. Enablement therefore must derive from the specification at the time of filing, which the above rejection shows is lacking. The applicants have not provided evidence that connectrons form or regulate gene expression. The applicants attempt to argue that the Wands factors considered in the above rejection should only be applied to subject matter considered in *In re Wands*. The

MPEP has adopted the methodology of *In re Wands* as a useful set of factors to consider for satisfaction of the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph as noted below:

2164.01 [R-5] Test of Enablement

Any analysis of whether a particular claim is supported by the disclosure in an application requires a determination of whether that disclosure, when filed, contained sufficient information regarding the subject matter of the claims as to enable one skilled in the pertinent art to make and use the claimed invention. The standard for determining whether the specification meets the enablement requirement was cast in the Supreme Court decision of *Mineral Separation v. Hyde*, 242 U.S. 261, 270 (1916) which postured the question: is the experimentation needed to practice the invention undue or unreasonable? That standard is still the one to be applied. *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, even though the statute does not use the term “undue experimentation,” it has been interpreted to require that the claimed invention be enabled so that any person skilled in the art can make and use the invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). See also *United States v. Teletronics, Inc.*, 857 F.2d 778, 785, 8 USPQ2d 1217, 1223 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (“The test of enablement is whether one reasonably skilled in the art could make or use the invention from the disclosures in the patent coupled with information known in the art without undue experimentation.”). A patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art. *In re Buchner*, 929 F.2d 660, 661, 18 USPQ2d 1331, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1384, 231 USPQ 81, 94 (Fed. Cir. 1986), cert. denied, 480 U.S. 947 (1987); and *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 1463, 221 USPQ 481, 489 (Fed. Cir. 1984). >Any part of the specification can support an enabling disclosure, even a background section that discusses, or even disparages, the subject matter disclosed therein. *Callicrate v. Wadsworth Mfg., Inc.*, 427 F.3d 1361, 77 USPQ2d 1041 (Fed. Cir. 2005)(discussion of problems with a prior art feature does not mean that one of ordinary skill in the art would not know how to make and use this feature).< Determining enablement is a question of law based on underlying factual findings. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 495, 20 USPQ2d 1438,

1444 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1576, 224 USPQ 409, 413 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

UNDUE EXPERIMENTATION

The fact that experimentation may be complex does not necessarily make it undue, if the art typically engages in such experimentation. In *re Certain Limited-Charge Cell Culture Microcarriers*, 221 USPQ 1165, 1174 (Int'l Trade Comm'n 1983), *aff'd sub nom.*, *Massachusetts Institute of Technology v. A.B. Fortia*, 774 F.2d 1104, 227 USPQ 428 (Fed. Cir. 1985). See also *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. The test of enablement is not whether any experimentation is necessary, but whether, if experimentation is necessary, it is undue. In *re Angstadt*, 537 F.2d 498, 504, 190 USPQ 214, 219 (CCPA 1976).

2164.01(a) Undue Experimentation Factors

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue." These factors include, but are not limited to:

- (A) The breadth of the claims;
- (B) The nature of the invention;
- (C) The state of the prior art;
- (D) The level of one of ordinary skill;
- (E) The level of predictability in the art;
- (F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor;
- (G) The existence of working examples; and
- (H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

In *re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (reversing the PTO's determination that claims directed to methods for detection of hepatitis B surface antigens did not satisfy the enablement requirement). In *Wands*, the court noted that there was no disagreement as to the facts, but merely a disagreement as to the interpretation of the data and the conclusion to be made from the facts. In

re Wands, 858 F.2d at 736-40, 8 USPQ2d at 1403-07. The Court held that the specification was enabling with respect to the claims at issue and found that "there was considerable direction and guidance" in the specification; there was "a high level of skill in the art at the time the application was filed;" and "all of the methods needed to practice the invention were well known." 858 F.2d at 740, 8 USPQ2d at 1406. After considering all the factors related to the enablement issue, the court concluded that "it would not require undue experimentation to obtain antibodies needed to practice the claimed invention." *Id.*, 8 USPQ2d at 1407. It is improper to conclude that a disclosure is not enabling based on an analysis of only one of the above factors while ignoring one or more of the others. The examiner's analysis must consider all the evidence related to each of these factors, and any conclusion of nonenablement must be based on the evidence as a whole. 858 F.2d at 737, 740, 8 USPQ2d at 1404, 1407.

A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The determination that "undue experimentation" would have been needed to make and use the claimed invention is not a single, simple factual determination. Rather, it is a conclusion reached by weighing all the above noted factual considerations. In re Wands, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. These factual considerations are discussed more fully in MPEP § 2164.08 (scope or breadth of the claims), § 2164.05(a) (nature of the invention and state of the prior art), § 2164.05(b) (level of one of ordinary skill), § 2164.03 (level of predictability in the art and amount of direction provided by the inventor), § 2164.02 (the existence of working examples) and § 2164.06 (quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure).

The applicant has not responded to the factual information cited in the prior art of Chan et al. that is in conflict with the proposed structures of connectrons.

Regarding the rejection of claims 3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, the claims are vague in their recitation of a synthetic connectron because it is not clear whether molecules or data is being claimed.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 17 is indefinite because lines 4-6 contain a large amount of alternatives in limiting the type of connectron that is the subject of the claimed subject matter which causes the claimed subject matter to be indefinite. In addition, lines 1-2 recite alternative embodiments of designing, identifying, detecting, and modeling, and it is not clear what method is being claimed. It may be helpful to expand the claim to more clearly describe what applicants intend to be the claimed subject matter.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John S. Brusca whose telephone number is 571 272-0714. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marjorie A. Moran can be reached on 571-272-0720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John S. Brusca/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1631

jsb